

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 TCHUTIMA, INC.,

9 Plaintiff(s),

10 v.

11 BUA GROUP, LLC,

12 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-01130-JCM-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 55]

13 Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion for leave to serve a supplemental expert
14 report. Docket No. 55. The Court has not identified in that motion any standards for seeking leave
15 from the Court to supplement an expert report. *See id.* at 10, 11. Moreover, the governing rule
16 contemplates supplementation in appropriate circumstances without seeking judicial pre-approval.
17 *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1)(A).*¹ Accordingly, the Court DENIES without prejudice Plaintiffs'
18 motion for leave to serve a supplemental expert report.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: January 7, 2025

21
22 
23 Nancy J. Koppe
24 United States Magistrate Judge
25
26

27 ¹ Such supplementation would be subject (if warranted) to the opposing party's filing of a
28 motion to exclude or other challenge. *See, e.g., Silvagni v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 320 F.R.D. 237,
240 n.1 (D. Nev. 2017).